DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 518 CE 000 694

AUTHOR Worthington, Robert M.
TITLE Career Education: Implications for Guidance and Counseling.
PUB DATE 17 Nov 72
NOTE 18p.; Keynote Address at the Florida Personnel and Guidance Association Annual Workshop, Tampa, Florida, November 17, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Educational Objectives; Models; *Occupational Guidance; Speeches; *Vocational Counseling

ABSTRACT

Career education is gaining acceptance as a way of making education more relevant and more human. There are five levels to the approach: Grades K-6 deals with career awareness; 7-9 provides occupational information and career exploration; 10-14 is concerned with job placement and specialized career education; the post-secondary level involves specific occupational preparation; and adult and continuing education covers the total spectrum. Since career education is an evolving concept, the levels are not distinct. The four models of career education (school-based, employer-based, home-based, and rural-residential) have implications for the role of counselor and the scope of responsibility of occupational guidance. The existence of varying opinions among nationally influential groups and individuals concerning career guidance, counseling, and placement emphasizes the need for specifying objectives appropriate to a comprehensive and integrated developmental program in these areas. These might include identification of career development needs of students at all levels, programs for all levels, coordinated activities, placement programs, outreach functions, and job adjustment counseling. Photographed from best available copy. (AG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085518

CAREER EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING*

BY ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON, Ph.D.
ASSOCIATE U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF ADULT, VOCATIONAL, AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 000 694

*Keynote Address at the Florida Personnel and Guidance Association Annual Workshop, Tampa, Florida, November 17, 1972

"There is no more disconcerting waste than the waste of human potential. And there is no better investment than an investment in human fulfillment. Career Education can help make education and training more meaningful for the student, more rewarding for the teacher, more available to the adult, more relevant for the disadvantaged, and more productive for our country."

President Nixon used those words in his State of the Union Message last January. And here today are some 1,200 or more of you -- diversified educators, counselors, social workers, and psychologists -- assembled to confer on the myriad aspects of "Life Planning: Choice or Chance?"

Obviously, your Commissioner of Education, Floyd Christian, and Donald Darling, and Administrator of Pupil Personnel for the State Department of Education, and all of you did not just start thinking about career education and its relationship with guidance. In fact, Florida has already designed and implemented a comprehensive vocational education program for career development. Legislation was passed in Florida last summer to support paraprofessionals serving as occupational specialists in career development, guidance, counseling, and placement. Several career development programs and projects which emphasize career guidance, counseling, and placement have also been subcontracted to county systems by the State department. One such project at the elementary school level with which I am familiar is Project LOOM (Learner-Oriented Occupational Materials) where materials are designed to provide hands-on experiences for children. In addition, several leadership conferences were held in Florida this year including a conference of

vocational, technical, and adult educators last August.

The U.S. Office of Education did not invent the idea of Career Education -- nor are all of the initiatives on its behalf coming from Washington. In many instances, the support of the Chief State School Officers for Federal initiatives is really an extension of convictions and actions already in use in State and local educational systems and in professional activities such as your Conference here today. The U.S. Commissioner of Educatic for example, told the Pennsylvania Personnel and Guidance Association Conference last November:

> My meeting with the Chief State School Officers (June 1971) was a high point in my first year as Commissioner of Education. . . . they endorsed the career education concept to a man. To a man they were willing to pledge the resources of their offices and their personal powers of persuasion as we attempt to hammer out the evolving definition and design of this large idea. To a man they assured me that career education is not just another education fad; this is a concept, they held, that must be advanced, and that all schools and their communities must have a hand in the process.

Let us also consider these national statistics for the 1970-71 school year. Of 3.7 million young people leaving formal education in 1970-71, nearly 2.5 million lacked skills adequate to enter the labor force at a level commensurate with their academic and intellectual

promise. Many left with no marketable skill whatsoever.

-- 850,000 dropped out of elementary or secondary school during the year. Let's assume on the average they left at the end of the 10th grade. At $8,000 per child to get them that far, the total cost to the Nation can be estimated at about $9 billion.

-- 750,000 graduated from the high school general curriculum with little or nothing to offer prospective employers. At $12,000 per student, total cost to the Nation would be $9 billion.

-- 850,000 entered college but left without a degree or completion of an organized occupational program. Let's assume, that on the average, they left at the end of the first college year, which added $3,000 to the $12,000 per pupil outlay through high school. The total cost to the Nation can be estimated at $12 billion.

These three groups of youngsters then represent a combined outlay of nearly $28 billion -- about one-third of the entire amount spent on education in this country last year. We spend billions to prepare 2.5 million young people for potential disenchantment, aimlessness and failure, year after year after year!

Even more distressing are the losses we cannot calculate in dollars -- the loss of confidence and self-esteem, the sense of alienation and drift, the terrible sense of abasement and nonfulfillment that burdens millions of young people as they embark upon their adult lives. The aftermath of these early defections often turns up in our unemployment, welfare, and crime statistics.

Such facts can satisfy neither our citizens' pocketbooks nor their consciences -- nor our own.

Yes, education must be made more relevant -- and more human. Students themselves tell us this, as do many prominent educators and businessmen. Jerome Bruner, for example, has recently suggested that we need to de-emphasize the structure of knowledge in favor of dealing with knowledge in the context of problems that face us. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce also issued a formal statement of policy on education -- in support of the broad concept of career education. Both from within and without the education profession, therefore, the potential of the career education theme for effecting a complete renewal of education in our country is gaining almost universal affirmation.

What is "career education"? It is an evolving concept -- broad and complex in many respects, straightforward and concrete in others. Right now, we must solicit each other's ideas, insight and support -- as indeed this Conference is expressly organized to do -- so that every positive initiative may be undertaken and sustained at all levels of Education.

Career education is a system of life-long education from the cradle to the grave. The system has five levels which are not distinct and often are overlapping. Each level has appropriate academic as well as vocational education. The first is the level of career awareness from kindergarten through the sixth grade. The second is occupational information and career exploration ranging from grades seven through nine. The third is job placement and specialized career education extending from the tenth through the twelfth or fourteenth years of schooling. The fourth is specific occupational preparation at the post-secondary level. The fifth and final level is adult and continuing education. It trains or retrains adults who need to upgrade their skills.

Career education would provide the training students require for success and at the same time give them the education they need to bring personal fulfillment into their lives. It would teach reading, writing and arithmetic as the fundamental skills. It would at the same time stress the ability to think, decide, and judge. The general curriculum, as it now stands in most schools, possesses neither the practicality of vocational courses nor the quality of college-preparatory offerings. What we propose in career education is to make the basic academic subjects much more relevant for the student in relationship to his future goals.

Career education is not another name for vocational education, nor for occupational training; but it acknowledges for its occupational training components the same prestige, concern, and recognition as the college preparatory curriculum. It is not only for disadvantaged or for "not-college-material" students; it is for all students--in varying degrees and forms according to their maturity and interests--but for everyone. It is not limited to preparation for, and advancement in, gainful employment; but it should assure that every young man and woman, no matter where he or she leaves the educational system, will possess a marketable job skill, at any age, at any time.

Career education, in this context, indeed has many implications for those who provide counseling and guidance services. Certainly, of major relevance to career education is the entire subject of the goals for career choice in career guidance and the process of career choice.

Career education is not designed to dictate career choices. Rather, the goals of career choice lie in its process, not in its end results. It is not what the individual chooses that concerns us. Rather, it is that he chooses which is important. It is the reality of choice rather than the realism of choice that is our primary concern. The wisdom of the basis on which individual choices are made is much more germane to evaluating effectiveness of career guidance than any judgements regarding the supposed "wisdom" of the choices that are made.

Given bonafide choices and adequate assistance in the decision making process, we have no doubt but what most individuals will choose in ways beneficial both to themselves and to society in general. This belief, like our belief in individual freedom, is absolute and without limits.

Lest misunderstanding result here, let me hasten to add that freedom to choose demands, as a prerequisite, that real choices be present. The term "choice" when applied to various alternatives implies that there is no automatic nor universal social ordering of such alternatives from "best" to "worst". Rather, it implies that the ordering of alternatives will be an individual matter--that the "best choice" for one individual may be the "worst choice" for another. That is what motivates many of us to work for the concept of career education. We do not fight for career education, but rather to make it possible for individuals to choose knowledgeably from among all the careers available to them.

The wisdom of the career choice decision is to be found in the ways in which the individual is able to gather accurate data regarding each of three important questions. These must be resolved by the individual in making a career decision. The first of these is "What is important to me?"

The second essential question is: "What is possible for me?" The third, and final, question in the career decision making process is: "What is probable for me?" We must find the ways in which a student is able to combine such data within the framework of his own personal value system so that he can answer each question for himself, and the ways in which he is able to devise and construct meaningful relationships among answers given to all three questions in ways that will lead him toward a reasoned career choice. Career education would reinforce this process of career choice.

We in the Office of Education are demonstrating our faith in this career education concept with some concentrated work and funds; specifically, we have launched six pilot projects in communities that represent a cross-section of socio-economic populations. School systems in these six districts had already been moving toward career education on their own or with State help. They are located in Mesa, Arizona; Los Angeles, California; Atlanta, Georgia; Jefferson County, Colorado; Pontiac, Michigan and Hackensack, New Jersey. And, last year I asked each State to initiate the planning of at least one intra-State model this year with Federal funds.

The first of these designs, the school-based model, calls for the restructuring of our elementary and secondary curricula to familiarize youngsters with the basic information about occupations in the primary grades, to help them get exposure to real work situations in the middle years, and to prepare them in senior high school either to enter their chosen field with a marketable skill upon graduation if not sooner, or continue on for technical or professional training at the college level. This model eliminates the general high school curriculum altogether

Instead, it builds a career orientation into the basic academic subjects all along the line, and helps every youngster learn about the many career choices available in such fields as manufacturing, marketing, health sciences, communications, public service, the professions and the trades. It provides for improved and extended guidance, counseling, and placement functions all along the line as well. And it gives every young person the necessary preparation to earn a living in a field he selects well before he or she leaves the educational system.

In addition to the school-based model, there are three other career education models. One is the employer-based, providing a structure in which industrial firms, businesses, and government agencies are able to operate work-training programs related to their own employment needs for students still in school as well as for dropouts. Clearly this is an alternative to conventional school. But there must also be extensive provisions for effective guidance, counseling, and placement functions in this model, too.

Another, the home-based model, among other devices, uses TV and correspondence courses to bring undereducated adults back into the mainstream of formal education or to help them get better jobs than they presently have. The last of the four is called the rural-residential model; its first site is a former Air Force base near Glasgow, Montana where entire families are living and train together for new and upgraded employment. This site serves six largely rural States.

But it is obvious that the realization of career education cannot be achieved solely as a result of Federal funds or U.S.O.E. initiatives. Our actions must be catalytic in a reaction taking place throughout our nation.

Last February, a Panel of Scholars met with key staff in the U.S. Office of Education to consider together their appropriate contributions to the emerging concept of career education in their own scholarly fields. The purpose of this ad hoc panel was for scholars and practitioners in various disciplines, -- for example, a philosopher an attorney, an economist, a sociologist, an anthropologist, a labor organization specialist and others outstanding in their fields of knowledge -- to serve as investigators -- "critics," -- if you will, and contributors to the concept of career education from their own scholarly or practical perspectives.

An effort which we initiated included, as a first step, last January's Career Guidance and Curriculum National Leadership Training Conference in St. Louis. The overal project under contract with the University of Missouri at Columbia was entitled, Cooperative State Implementation Workshops for Career Development, Guidance, Counseling, and Placement. It was designed to provide leadership and technical assistance to the States to help them formulate and implement the career development, guidance, counseling, and placement functions which will be crucial to the planning and realization of the total career education thrust. This contract project has carried through to implementation some of the goals, concepts, and principles originally recommended by a coordinated series of National and Regional conferences on "guidance, counseling, and placement in career development and educational-occupational decision making." I am certain that some of you participated in either the October 1969 National conference or in one of the conferences held in each HEW region the following year. The contract was designed to encourage and assist each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in

workshop. The purpose of each State workshop, which took place last spring or in the summer, was for State personnel to develop--or improve any existing--home--school--community model for implementing career development guidance, counseling, and placement in their respective local school districts.

Our Bureau is also involved in monitoring a contract with the American Institutes for Research in Palo Alto, California. The title of this new project is: "An Assessment of Career Guidance, Counseling, and Placement for Non-College Bound Students in Public Secondary Schools." This "assessment" is now underway and will provide two major products by May 30, 1973. The first is a survey of all existing literature bearing on a number of specific hypotheses concerning the status of guidance, counseling, and placement for non-college bound youths. The second is an identification and analysis of 15 highly effective career guidance, counseling, and placement programs in local secondary schools. These two products will provide an additional baseline for further development of USOE policies in this area.

While it is clear that a national movement to improve and expand career guidance, counseling, and placement is substantially underway--and now gaining impetus rapidly--it is of paramount importance that all of us think carefully about what we would redirect our sights, our talents, and the public's resources towards-- and why. The guidance, counseling, and placement functions, their practitioners, and the practitioners' teachers--like most of the rest of us in education, have, as you all well know, been receiving "their lumps," too.

It is helpful, as one kind of approach to examining needed redirection to take a systematic look at what nationally influential groups and spokesmen have been saying about, and expecting of, career guidance, counseling, and placement in recent years. Such an approach was taken about 2 years ago by appropriate Bureau program staff and advisers. They researched this question by identifying and analyzing dozens of source documents bearing on the subject. They then synthesized from their findings a catalog of areas of "national concern" about career guidance, counseling, and placement. The 28 areas of nationally expressed concerns (which I will not take the time to read to you) were grouped in 5 broad categories. These I will list for you because, among other things, they suggest the scope of attention and responsibilities which must be involved in a systematic redirection. The 5 broad categories are: Direct Service Functions, Management and Support Functions, Media and Methods, Staff Development and Target Population Groups (in general and in particular). The authors closed their report with this statement:

> The authors would impress upon the reader the essential unity of the message which these many different sources, over a substantial period of time, have been conveying to the interested public, the government, and us professionals. It is also crystal clear that this message strikes far beyond the professional-technical repertoire, priorities, and attitudes of the direct service teacher and counselor, which are, of course, included, to the highest levels of legislative, policy and planning, and management attention.

A critique which has received much attention is Eli Ginzberg's Career Guidance: Who Needs It, Who Provides It, Who Can Improve It? Many of its criticisms and recommendations are similar to, and therefore reinforce, those made by other "nationally influential groups and spokesmen" as identified in the report described above. Ginsberg, too, acknowledges that the career guidance functions have been restricted by "manpower, money, and other constraints." He, also reports that "counselors appear to spend the bulk of their time in approving courses of study, in assisting with college applications, in dealing with rule infractions and test administration. Few spend a significant amount of time in activities designed to lead to improved decision making and long-range planning . . ." He charges that "guidance, like education, has been caught up in its own rhetoric for so long that it balks at anything less than remaking man and society."

Ginzberg offers many specific recommendations, as a number of which are already widely accepted in principle, if not yet in operation and they are integral to the career education and guidance modeling already underway, including the 1969-to-present coordinated series of national and regional conferences and State implementation workshops on career development guidance, counseling, and placement previously described to you. A few specific examples are minorities and women as emphasized "target populations," team work by counselors and teachers, closer working with resource persons and agencies outside the school, revision of counselor (and teacher) education to include, among other improvements, more field work investigating the dynamics of the labor market and modification of counselor and teacher certification standards.

But at least one of Ginzberg's major recommendations--for guidance leaders to take a public stand against the use of counselors in elementary schools--is antithetical to a career development approach, kindergarten through adulthood for the guidance, counseling and placement functions. Ginzberg's explanation for his stand, astonishingly, is that "as properly trained guidance counselors primarily concerned with career development [underlining supplied] we have little to contribute to the elementary school." Perhaps his view is attributable to a connotation of "career" much more limited than the one our own efforts employ or to a continuing narrow, rather than expanding, conception of a counselor responsibility, or to both.

This kind of conflict, in any event, illustrates the basic need expressed before, for all of us in guidance and counseling to think carefully about the directions we may take--and why, about our implicit assumptions, the substance of our understandings, and the effective communication achieved with others.

Actually, a good deal of forward-looking work in career guidance and counseling has been going on for a number of years now. Unfortunately this is not generally well-know by educators and is even less well-known by non-educators. This is not to say--and I emphasize it--that the generally criticized conditions have been substantially resolved in many places. But it is to say that we in education are a long way from scratch in identifying directions and developing means for progress. Here are just a few observations in support of this statement:

In relation to vocational education, it is a fact that the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 have been giving continuing impetus, leadership and support

to a wide range of State and national conferences, seminars and workshops. Some of the national ones not already mentioned in this address include a conference on "Implementing Career Development Theory and Research Through the Curriculum," a "National Seminar on Vocational Guidance," and a conference on "Vocational Aspects of Counselor Education." These are cited to you because useful reports of recommendations and guidelines resulted from them, they have been significantly affecting career guidance in education, and they are available to all for help in redirecting guidance and counseling for career development.

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education issued a special report on guidance, counseling, and placement last spring. For several months a special Council subcommittee on guidance collated pertinent materials, conferred with national leaders of guidance, U.S.O.E. officials, and other concerned groups, and solicited papers position papers in preparation for this report. The subcommittee also met with representatives of guidance "consumer" groups to obtain their views. The special report of recommended priorities and policies from this Presidentally appointed Council has had great impact on public policy and support for career development guidance, counseling and placement.

And not to be overlooked are the substantial new provisions for guidance and counseling incorporated in educational legislation currently pending further action in the Congress.

At this juncture, the major national need has substantially shifted from portrayals of "what is wrong with guidance" to the need for sound delineations of "what will be right with guidance"--and, therefore, of

"what guidance" justifies in terms of increasing solid support in public policy and allocation of resources.

A comprehensive and integrated developmental program of career guidance, counseling, and placement-responsive to the needs of all in-school youth, and also to the needs of youth and adults already in the job market who need further education or training--must be designed for such outcomes as the following:

First, identification of, and prompt attention to, the career development needs, characteristics, and circumstances of all students, at all educational levels, with an increasing proportion of attention given to the disadvantaged and handicapped;

Second, developmental programs of self and career orientation and information beginning in kindergarten through post-secondary and adult for all students;

Third, systematic and sequential activities by the total school at all levels to facilitate the educational-occupational decision making of all students while taking into consideration their age and maturity

Fourth, job placement programs that assist each student to gain employment and to satisfactorily hold a job;

Fifth, an outreach function aimed at youth outside the school system and designed to help them to return to an appropriate learning situation or to part-time training and related employment; and

Finally, follow through and linkage assistance, including job adjustment counseling.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize once again my strong convictions regarding the process of career choice and career development.

Career development is essentially a lifelong process, beginning early in the pre-school years and continuing, for most individuals, through retirement. As a process, it includes the view one has of himself as a worker, the view he has of work itself, the knowledge he acquires about himself and his possible work opportunities, the choices he makes related to himself as a worker, and the ways in which he implements those choices. Programs of career development concern themselves with each of these facets of the total process.

Personal choices involved in career development are taking place on a continuing basis throughout the life of the individual. Choices involving personal life styles, personal values, and leisure time preferences are as much a part of career development as are occupational choices.

The freedom to choose occupations is among the most treasured of all those promised American citizens. This freedom to choose, theoretically, is without limit. It extends even to the freedom to choose not to choose. It is predicated on the assumption that, given such freedom, most individuals will choose in ways which, in the long run, will not only bring satisfaction to themselves but also maximum contributions to society.

To express a commitment to a philosophy of freedom to choose in no way guarantees that such freedom will, for a given individual, be present. There can be no freedom of occupational choice for those who have never learned <u>how</u> to make occupational decisions. One cannot choose from among opportunities unless he <u>knows</u> what those opportunities are. In addition to knowledge, <u>understanding</u> is also an essential element

in the making of decisions. Even the best of decisions benefits the individual little if he has no concrete way of implementing the decision he has made. How can we speak about freedom of occupational choice unless the individual is given the opportunity to understand himself as well as the variety of options open to him?

A career education thrust in American education simultaneously demands and promises a top priority for redirecting and expanding guidance counseling, and placement; all of us can help achieve this priority because career development will operate at every level and in every setting represented in career education.